

spirit from heaven or perdition to startle, without convincing. It is as true to-day as it was in the days of Christ that if people will not hear Moses and the prophets, "they would not be persuaded though one should rise from the dead." If Divine truth cannot convince, what can men or even angels do? *Presbyterian Banner*.

DISESTABLISHMENT.

The conflict thickens around the venerable Church of Scotland by law established. Undoubtedly this will be the next of the British Churches to hear the blow of the axe which will sever it from all connection with the State, and when it ceases to be the State Church of the northern part of the Island the stately Church of England may gather her garments about her and await in patience the fate which will surely overtake her. Presbyterianism and Episcopacy will have to learn together how to live without the supporting arm, or rather supporting purse, of the civil power. The history of the Free Church of Scotland is proof that this lesson is one that any earnest church can thoroughly comprehend and effectually put in practice.

The late Assembly of the Church of Scotland made no deliverance, of course, on the subject of disestablishment. Its strength is to sit still. With the endowments in its hand it can be quiet until the roar of the populace is heard more distinctly and more threateningly. A defence will be made, and a sturdy one, but at present it rests on its arms. The United Presbyterian Church stands where it has stood for many years—inflexibly opposed to all Establishments. The Free Church, beginning with the assertion of an ideal establishment, a union of Church and State in which the rights of all parties might be preserved, has come round to a position where the majority of her members and ministers are in opposition to the continuance of the present Establishment, and are doubtful whether the ideal Establishment can ever be set up.

The agitation is going on, and the debate has been made much warmer by a letter of the Hon. Mr. Gladstone, addressed to Professor Rainey, of the New College in Edinburgh, which has just been made public. Mr. Gladstone is before a constituency for election to the British Parliament, and this and his high public position in the nation gives interest and importance to his words. The general interpretation put on his letter is that it "is an intimation that he leaves the subject in the hands of the Scottish people

that while he is not disposed, in the present state of public affairs, to regard it as occupying the first place, he has no objection to its being pressed as an electoral question in Scotland, and that what he chiefly desires is, that the Scottish people should pronounce an 'intelligible and distinct' judgment respecting it."

This is not very definite, but it is a fair inference that if they do give an intelligible and distinct judgment against the Church, he will not be unwilling to do unto the Presbyterian Establishment of Scotland as he did to the Episcopal Establishment of Ireland—free it from all alliance with the State. — *Philadelphia Presbyterian*.

AUGUSTINE ON THE THEATRE.

His testimony with reference to theatre-going is very explicit. While a student at Carthage he was particularly attracted by the theatre, the spectacles at which were of unusual magnificence. The Christian Church, as it has been said, "abhorred the pagan theatre. The idolatrous rites, the lascivious attitudes, the shows, which were its inseparable accompaniments, were equally opposed to the dogmatic monotheism, to the piety, and to the mercy of the gospel." One of the most significant signs of a man having become a Christian was his habitual absence from the theatre; and no one was more emphatic on this point afterwards than Augustine himself. In his Confessions he goes to the root of the matter. Supposing obscenity and idolatry to be banished from the stage, and taking it at its best estate, are its effects morally wholesome? Is it good that the passive emotions should be excited, when no active exertion is intended to follow? Augustine, as the result of his own experience, very decidedly pronounces against theatre-going even under its most favourable condition.

EVERY burden of sorrow seems like a stone hung around our neck, yet they are often like the stones used by the pearl divers, which enables them to reach the prize and to rise enriched.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

ANGLO-ISRAEL—NO. III.

Your correspondent "Enquirer" seems inclined to treat me very much in the same way as the magistrates of Jedburgh were accustomed to do in ancient times when business was brisk in their line, viz.: "Hang first and try afterwards."

At the beginning of his letter, he, "after looking into the subject," as he says, classifies it among "plausible absurdities;" then asks questions which show that he himself does not think the subject so absurd as he would have us believe, then states four propositions for solution which demonstrates to me that if he looked into the subject at all, he did it in the most superficial manner, and ends by demanding proofs.

For the benefit of those who have not looked into the subject, as well as for "Enquirer," I will submit the following as answers to his queries:

He demands first Ethnological and Philological evidence, and states dogmatically that the origin of all the races forming our nation is well known, and it is well known that we are not descended from the House of Israel at all. I do not wish to be dogmatic. I will not assert anything without giving what I consider, and what others skilled in this line of study believe to be sufficient evidence for the conclusions arrived at. I should, however, like exceedingly to hear his proofs for our "well known descent." Perhaps he is a believer in our Hamitic origin as affirmed by Pinkerton the historian; but, "who was charged by an able historian in England with coming to the most rash conclusions, and being altogether chronologically wrong. If he is, does he acknowledge his resemblance in the following passage of Scripture, "And Noah said cursed be Ham the father of Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren; and he said blessed be Jehovah the God of Shem, and Canaan shall be their servant, God shall expand Japheth and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be their servant," (Arabic version). For my part when I find such men as Sharon Turner the historian, and Dr. Margolionth the philologist men acknowledged by our opponents to be reliable authorities testifying to the fact of our having come (about 50 to 100 years after the captivity) from the very place into which we had been led as captives, and bringing with us numerous traces, both in our historical traditions and language, of our Hebrew connection, I am inclined to accept their evidence before the dogmatic assertion of even such students as "Enquirer." But if "Enquirer" or any other person is desirous to look into our descent more at large, I would refer them to the following works:

"Israel in Britain: the collected papers on the Ethnic and Philological Argument," by Cockburn Muir, price 4d. "Israelitish Origin of the Anglo-Saxon, Irish, Scotch and Welsh, an historical proof," by T. C. Balmer, price 6d. The "Anglo-Israel Post-Bag," by Canon (now Bishop) Titcomb, price 1s. 6d. The "Banner of Israel," (published weekly, price 1d.), No. 47, 21st Nov., 1877, containing an article by Dr. Margolionth, extracted from the "Jewish Chronicle." "Are the English People the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel?" by Philo-Israel, price 4d. All these are works within the reach of "Enquirer," or the poorest reader of the CANADA PRESBYTERIAN, and may be had of Messrs. Wm. Drysdale & Co., Montreal.

But "Enquirer" professes that he will be satisfied with another kind of proof—and I am glad he has so expressed himself—for the historical and philological arguments are such as would occupy great time and large space in your paper, which can ill be spared, and the Word of God ought to be evidence sufficient to any person professing to be a Christian, even if opposed by men of learning and science.

His proposition is this, "Suppose it could be shown (1) that certain blessings were promised to God's Israel; (2) that the Anglo-Saxon race enjoyed these blessings; (3) that only God's Israel could enjoy them, then it would follow that the Anglo-Saxon race is God's Israel." Still, what is meant by God's Israel? Does it mean "Israel according to the flesh?" His first proposition is similar, viz.: "What constitutes identity in this question? Is it lineal and natural descent?" I reply: Certainly it is, for to Abraham's seed were the promises given (not his seed according to the flesh). Read the passage he has quoted in Rom. ii. 28; ix. 6, 8; Gal. iii. 9, 14, 29, with their contexts, and you

will find that the seed according to the flesh consisted of Ishmael and his descendants, the children of Keturah and their descendants, and Esau and his descendants; but to the seed of the promise, "For in Isaac shall thy seed be called," read the first thirteen verses of Rom. ix., and while the promise runs, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The fact that "all families" shall be blessed does not prevent the literal seed from being blessed, being as they are the conveyors of that blessing from God, through Christ, to all the families of mankind, and nowhere can "Enquirer" produce a solitary text to show that any of the temporal blessings promised to Israel were promised to any other people whatever. Here are some of them: Israel was to become a strong power in the north and west, and occupying the islands of the sea. A nation never defeated by Gentile foes and never by them successfully invaded. Its own ports always inviolate. Mistress of the seas because possessing the "gates of its enemies." The chief of nations, having an immense heathen empire. Possessing immense wealth, lending to all nations and borrowing from none, with possessions forming a girdle round the Gentile nations and thus owning the ends, the sides, and the uttermost parts of the earth, all these the British have and no other nation has them.

Here are a few more. They were to push nations in corners, Deut. xxxiii. 17. The aborigines of their colonies must be dying out, Jer. xxx. 11. They must be a strong war power, Jer. li. 20. Their armies in the field, though fewer in number than their enemies' armies, will be victorious, Lev. xxvi. 8. They must have abolished the slave trade, Isa. lviii. 6. They must be a missionary people, Isa. xxvii. 6, 43, 21. Unlike Judah, they must be known upon the earth by another name, Isa. lxxv. 15. They must be rapidly increasing, Hos. i. 10. They must have a nation springing from them but entirely independent of them, Gen. xlviii. 19; Isa. xlix. 20. Their islands must have been too small for them more than once, Isa. xlix. 20.

Plenty more can be given, but these may for the present suffice. All these promises ("Enquirer" would find it hard to spiritualize) were promised to Abraham's seed, the children of Jacob or Israel, and to no other people under the sun, and that there should be no mistaking of them in their after history, he gave them and them only titles corresponding to their character and the work they should perform. "God's witnesses" (or Protestants), Isa. xliii. 10. "His light bearers," Isa. xlix. 6. "His servants," Isa. xliii. 10. "His salvation to the ends of the earth," Isa. xliii. 10. "His inheritance," Deut. ix. 26, 29; xxxii. 9; 1 Sam. x. 1. 2 Sam. xxi. 3; Isa. xix. 25; Jer. x. 16. "His peculiar people which He chose for Himself out of all nations of the earth." "To be for a name and a praise unto Him in all the earth," Isa. xliii. 21; xlii. 10; Jer. xliii. 11; Zeph. iii. 20.

I leave it to any unbiassed mind whether we, as a nation, do not bear the features here represented. Even "Enquirer" himself acknowledges the resemblance, for he says, "the Anglo-Saxon race was obedient, became God's people, and obtained the promises." Therefore, (I say in almost "Enquirer's" own words) the Christian Anglo-Saxon race is Israel, was formerly and is now the people of God, and are enjoying Abraham's blessings, Isa. liv. 7, 8, "For a small moment have I forsaken thee," etc. While the Jews who are also the descendants of Abraham (but in St. Paul's day counted as the children of the bond-woman because of their unbelief, Gal. iv. 25) will when they look on him whom they have pierced, be again brought in and made heirs with us of all the blessings by becoming one nation with us, Ezek. xxxvii. 22.

"Enquirer" adds, "but it cannot be shown that only the natural descendants of Jacob are to enjoy the spiritual blessings promised to the seed of Abraham," to this I reply that it was very far from my thoughts to even suggest such a preposterous idea, for how could all families of the earth be blessed if it were so. "Enquirer" should be honest and not invent ideas for me. He asks what I would say to the following statement? "Certain promises were made to Israel, if obedient; Israel was disobedient, therefore failed to obtain them." "Enquirer" when he wrote this letter had not seen my second paper, otherwise I think he would not have asked me this question. But, lest my last paper did not go far enough to show that God's oath, and therefore his honour and glory, is concerned in the literal fulfilling of all the promises made to the literal seed of Abraham, allow me to add to the proofs